

On the proof of some theorem on locally nilpotent subgroups in division rings

Bui Xuan Hai

Faculty of Mathematics & Computer Science, University of Science

VNU - HCM City

227 Nguyen Van Cu str., Dist. 5, Ho Chi Minh City, Vietnam

e-mail: bxhai@hcmuns.edu.vn

Nguyen Van Thin

Faculty of Mathematics & Computer Science, University of Science

VNU - HCM City

227 Nguyen Van Cu str., Dist. 5, Ho Chi Minh City, Vietnam

e-mail: ngvthin@yahoo.com.vn

Abstract

In Hai-Thin (2009), there is a theorem, stating that every locally nilpotent subnormal subgroup in a division ring D is central (see Hai-Thin (2009, Th. 2.2)). Unfortunately, there is some mistake in the proof of this theorem. In this note we give the another proof of this theorem.

Key words: locally nilpotent, central.

Mathematics Subject Classification 2000: 16K20

In Hai-Thin (2009, Th. 2.2) there is the following theorem:

Theorem 1. (see Hai-Thin (2009, Th. 2.2)) *Let D be a division ring with the center $Z(D)$. Then, every locally nilpotent subnormal subgroup of D^* is central, i.e. it is contained in $Z(D)$.*

Unfortunately, in the proof of this theorem there is some mistake. However, the theorem remains always true. Here we give the another proof of this theorem.

Lemma 2. *Let D be a non-commutative division ring and suppose that G is a subnormal locally nilpotent subgroup of D^* . If $x, y \in G$ with $[x, y] := x^{-1}y^{-1}xy \neq 1$, then $[x, y] \notin Z(D)$.*

Proof. Since G is subnormal in D^* , there exists the following series of subgroups:

$$G = G_n \triangleleft G_{n-1} \triangleleft \dots \triangleleft G_1 \triangleleft G_0 = D^*.$$

Suppose that $x, y \in G$ with $b = [x, y] \neq 1$ and $[x, y] \in Z(D)$. Set

$$x_1 := [x + 1, y], x_{i+1} := [x_i, y], \forall i \geq 1.$$

We shall prove by induction that $x_k \in G_k, \forall k \in \{1, \dots, n\}$. In fact, since $y \in G \leq G_k, \forall k$, it follows that $x_1 = (1 + x)^{-1}y^{-1}(1 + x)y \in G_1$. Now, suppose that $x_k \in G_k$, then, $x_{k+1} = [x_k, y] = (x_k^{-1}y^{-1}x_k)y \in G_{k+1}$. Thus, $x_k \in G_k, \forall k \in \{1, \dots, n\}$. In particular, $x_n \in G_n = G$. By supposition, G is locally nilpotent, so the subgroup $\langle x_n, y \rangle$ generated by elements x_n and y , is nilpotent. Hence, there exists some integer t such that $x_t = 1$. Let P be a prime subfield of D . Then, by Scott(1987, 14.3.2, p. 432), there exists some polynomial $g \in P(b)[X]$ such that $g(x) = 0$ and, moreover, g is not dependent either on x or y , but it is dependent only on b . Clearly, for any $m \in \mathbb{Z}$ such that $mx \neq 0$, we have $[mx, y] = [x, y] = b$. Therefore, $g(mx) = 0, \forall m \in \mathbb{Z}$ such that $mx \neq 0$. Evidently, this forces $Char(D) = p > 0$. Suppose that $f(X) = \sum_{i=0}^r a_i X^i \in P(b)[X]$ with $a_r = 1$, is the minimal polynomial of the element x over $P(b)$. Then

$$f(x) = \sum_{i=0}^r a_i x^i = 0 \text{ and } y^{-1}f(x)y = \sum_{i=0}^r a_i b^i x^i = 0.$$

It follows that $a_1(b - 1) + \dots + a_r(b^r - 1)x^{r-1} = 0$. Therefore, $b^r - 1 = 0$ or $b^r = 1$. Hence $P(b)$ is a finite field. Thus, x is algebraic over a finite field $P(b)$. By symmetry, we can conclude that y is algebraic over $P(b)$ too. Set $K := \{\sum a_{ij}x^i y^j \mid a_{ij} \in P(b)\}$. Since $[x, y] = b \in Z(D)$, K is closed under the multiplicative operation in D , so, clearly it is a subring of D . Moreover, since x and y both are algebraic over a finite field $P(b)$, it is easy to see that K is finite. Therefore, K is a finite division ring and by Wedderburn's Theorem K is a field. In particular, x and y commute with each other and that is a contradiction. ■

Proof of Theorem 1. Clearly we can suppose that D is non-commutative. In the first, we shall prove that G is abelian. Thus, suppose that G is non-abelian. Then, there exist elements $x, y \in G$ such that $[x, y] \neq 1$. Let $H = \langle x, y \rangle$ be the subgroup of G generated by x and y . Set

$$H_0 = H, H_1 = [H_0, H_0] \text{ and } H_i = [H_{i-1}, H] \text{ for all } i \geq 2.$$

Since H is non-abelian nilpotent subgroup, there exists the integer $s \geq 1$ such that $H_s \neq 1$ and $H_{s+1} = 1$. By definition we have

$$H_s = \langle [a, b] \mid a \in H_{s-1}, b \in H \rangle \neq 1.$$

Therefore, there exist $a_0 \in H_{s-1}, b_0 \in H$ such that $c := [a_0, b_0] \neq 1$. Since $c \in H_s$ and $H_{s+1} = 1$, c commutes with each element from H . In particular, c commutes with both x and y . Now, suppose that

$$G = G_n \triangleleft G_{n-1} \triangleleft \dots \triangleleft G_1 \triangleleft G_0 = D^*.$$

By setting $D_1 = C_D(c), N_i = G_i \cap D_1$ for all $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$, we obtain

$$N = N_n \triangleleft N_{n-1} \triangleleft \dots \triangleleft N_1 \triangleleft N_0 = D_1^*.$$

So N is a subnormal locally nilpotent subgroup of D_1^* . Since x and y are both commute with c , $H = \langle x, y \rangle \leq D_1^*$. It follows that $H \leq D_1^* \cap G_n = N_n = N$. Hence $a_0, b_0 \in N$. Since $c = [a_0, b_0] \neq 1$, by Lemma 2, $c \notin Z(D_1)$. In the other hand, since $D_1 = C_D(c), c \in Z(D_1)$ and we have a contradiction. Thus, G is abelian. Now, in view of Scott (1987, 14.4.4, p.440) G is contained in $Z(D)$. ■

Acknowledgement. The authors thank Mojtaba Ramezannassab for some his remarks concerning the proof of our theorem in Hai-Thin (2009, Th.2.2).

References

- [1] Bui Xuan Hai and Nguyen Van Thin, On Locally Nilpotent Subgroups of $GL_1(D)$, *Communications in Algebra*, 37:2, 712-718.
- [2] Scott, W.R. (1987), Group theory. *Dover Publication, INC*.